

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-5, 8-14 and 17-24 are now present in the application. The Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18 have been amended. Claims 21-24 have been added. Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 4, 8, 9, 13, 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, claims 4 and 13 have been rewritten into independent form to include the subject matter of their respective based claims 1 and 11, which were indicated by the Examiner as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 4 and 13 are in condition for allowance.

In addition, claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 have been rewritten into independent form to include the subject matter of their respective based claims 1 and 11. Although the intervening claims 6 and 15 have not been incorporated into those claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Murakami in view of Mashita still fail to teach the amended independent claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 at least for the reasons specified by the Examiner on pages 5-6 of the instant Office Action. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the formal drawings of the instant application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12, 14-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami, U.S. Patent No. 6,812,631, in view of Mashita, Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 2000-306528. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to claims 1 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite a combination of elements including "the panel, the funnel, and the reinforcing band satisfy... $10.5\text{mm} \leq h \leq 20\text{mm}$ " and "a tube axis directional distance from the outer surface center of the panel to a front edge portion of the reinforcing band is h ". Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in amended

independent claims 1 and 11 are not disclosed or suggested by references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Murakami fails to disclose the reinforcing band and the condition of $10.5\text{mm} \leq h \leq 20\text{mm}$. With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Mashita, the Examiner alleged that Mashita in Table 1 discloses that the condition of $10.5\text{mm} \leq h \leq 20\text{mm}$ (see page 6, CRT5 and CRT6). Applicants respectfully disagree. As shown in Mashita's Table 1, the experiments indicate that the results for CRT5 and CRT6 are unacceptable. In particular, Mashita discloses that the experiment results show that the glass debris of CRT5 and CRT6 spread out to a wide range during the experiments and therefore CRT5 and CRT6 cannot satisfy the UL specification (see paragraph [0040]). Therefore, Mashita merely discloses an unsuccessful experiment and an unacceptable result when the tube axis directional distance from the outer surface center of the panel to a front edge portion of the reinforcing band is 12–16.5mm. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation to modify Murakami in view of Mashita's unsuccessful experiments of CRT5 and CRT6.

Accordingly, since there is no motivation to modify Murakami in view of Mashita's unsuccessful experiments of CRT5 and CRT6, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 11 clearly define over the teachings of the utilized references.

In addition, claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 12, 14, 19 and 20 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 11, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 11, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19 and 20 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Claims 21-24 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21-24 respectively depend directly from amended independent claims 8, 9, 17 and 18, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from amended independent claims 8, 9, 17 and 18, which are believed to be allowable. Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 21-24 are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

DUE: July 24, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

DRAFT

By James T. Eller, Jr.
James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

GJH